

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and for the personal interview conducted on January 26, 2005. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and the interview, and this paper provided in response thereto.

Claims 1-20, 22-38, and 40-62 have been previously presented. Claims 21 and 39 have been canceled. Claims 14, 16, and 48 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but being allowable if put into independent format.

Claims 1-13, 15, 17-20, 22-38, 40-47, and 49-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Geisler *et al.* (U.S. 6,252,989), in view of Molloy (U.S. 6,078,349). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a method of “transmitting first image data with a low resolution over a *first transmission channel*” and “transmitting second image data corresponding to the image areas viewed currently, or in future, by said at least one user, said transmitting second image data being transmitted with a higher resolution over a *second transmission channel*” (emphasis added).

Similarly, claim 55 recites a method of “transmitting first image data over a *first transmission channel*” and “transmitting second image data over a *second transmission channel*, said second image data having a higher resolution than said first image data” (emphasis added).

Claim 56 recites similar limitations to those above. Claims 58, 61, and 62 all recite a *first transmission channel* for transmitting first image data, and a *second transmission channel* for transmitting second image data at a higher resolution.

In the Office action, the Examiner cited Molloy as teaching a first transmission channel for transmitting a low resolution image, and second

transmission channel for transmitting a higher resolution image. Specifically, the Examiner cited col. 10, lines 7-17 of the reference.

However, at the personal interview, applicants representative pointed out to the Examiner that the cited section of Molloy refers to figure 1, which shows only a *single* transmission channel 25 connecting the video transmitter 34 to the video receiver 36. Furthermore, the reference merely teaches displaying regions of high interest in a higher resolution than regions of low interest, which can be displayed in a lower resolution or not displayed at all (see abstract, and see e.g., col. 2, line 60 to col. 3, line 14 and col. 3 lines 54-60). There is no suggestion of using *two separate transmission channels* to send the different resolution images. The Examiner agreed to reconsider the rejection based on this discussion at the interview.

Accordingly, the cited claims are each patentable over the references because the combination does not teach two transmission channels as recited in the claims.

Furthermore, as also discussed at the interview, the claims 1, 56, 58, and 62 all recite a reverse channel for transmitting a viewing direction. As shown in figure 1, Molloy teaches that the same transmission channel 25 for sending the video data is also used for connecting the focus coordinates transmitter 24 to the focus coordinates receiver 26. Thus, claims 1, 56, 58, and 62 are also patentable over the combination of the references for this reason as well. The Examiner also agreed to reconsider the rejection based on this discussion at the interview as well.

The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, upon one of the above claims, and thus are all patentable over the references for at least the same reasons as their parent claim.

Furthermore, the Examiner has failed to provide the proper motivation for combining the references, merely relying on the benefits of the secondary reference without the proper analysis or support in the prior art. Thus, the rejections are improper for this reason as well.

Appl. No. 10/082,837
Amdt. Dated February 8, 2005
Reply to Office action of November 8, 2004

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 34415.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48540

1801 East 9th Street, Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: February 8, 2005